EXHIBIT G

From: Flores, Rommy

To: Richard Min; Davis, Thad A.

Cc: Camilla Redmond; Azcona R; Jacobson-Kwok Michelle; Lash Brittani; Hesse, Danielle

Subject: RE: Dias v. Dias - DVRO Granted and Jurisdiction Found - Response Requested

Date: Wednesday, March 12, 2025 8:15:13 AM

Richard -

Judge Chen's orders were specifically about California state courts taking over the case, which can't happen until your client is served with the now entered TRO which confirms what he has been disputing in bad faith: he is subject to California jurisdiction. You and your client through you told Judge Chen petitioner would consent to that jurisdiction. This conduct is in violation of the Court's resulting order.

These games of whack-a-mole you and your client are playing are putting our client in grave physical danger and are explicitly what we sought to prevent in seeking a dismissal with strong protections. Since at every turn both your client appears to be refusing service, and you appear to be disavowing your duties here including to meet and confer, we will be forced seek relief from the Court.

In the meantime, please let us know if you consent to us contacting petitioner directly as Ms. Azcona has consented. Also please confirm whether petitioner is in or planning to travel to California and if yes explain why he didn't give the required notice.

Rommy Flores

Of Counsel

<u>T: +1 213.229.7966 | M: +1 213.335.1672</u> <u>RFlores@gibsondunn.com</u>

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP 333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197

From: Richard Min <rmin@gkmrlaw.com> **Sent:** Wednesday, March 12, 2025 7:26 AM

To: Davis, Thad A. <TDavis@gibsondunn.com>; Flores, Rommy <RFlores@gibsondunn.com> **Cc:** Camilla Redmond <credmond@gkmrlaw.com>; Azcona R <lr_azcona@yahoo.com>; Jacobson-

Kwok Michelle <Michelle@ljtlawgroup.com>; Lash Brittani
brittani@ljtlawgroup.com>; Hesse,

Danielle < DHesse@gibsondunn.com>

Subject: RE: Dias v. Dias - DVRO Granted and Jurisdiction Found - Response Requested

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

What is the point of the meet and confer? I do not read the order as requiring acceptance of service with regards to any future orders. As that is the request you are making, I would find any application to the Court in that regard to be frivolous. I also have no authority to act otherwise.

Richard Min | Green Kaminer Min & Rockmore LLP

rmin@gkmrlaw.com | www.gkmrlaw.com Fellow of the International Academy of Family Lawyers

Manhattan Office:

420 Lexington Ave. Ste. 2821 New York, NY 10170

T: 212.681.6400 | D: 212.257.1944

Long Island Office:

600 Old Country Rd. Ste. 410 | Garden City, NY 11530

T: 516.858.2115

ATTENTION:

This electronic message transmission contains information from a law firm which may be confidential or privileged. This information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. You should delete the message and attachments without printing, copying, forwarding or saving them. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately. Disclosure under IRS Circular 230: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) was not intended or written to be used, and may not be used, for the purpose of avoiding tax-related penalties under federal, state or local tax law or promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed therein.

From: Davis, Thad A. <<u>TDavis@gibsondunn.com</u>>

Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2025 9:20 PM

To: Flores, Rommy < RFlores@gibsondunn.com>

<lr_azcona@yahoo.com>; Jacobson-Kwok Michelle < Michelle@ljtlawgroup.com>; Lash Brittani <bri>drittani@litlawgroup.com>; Hesse, Danielle <DHesse@gibsondunn.com>

Subject: Re: Dias v. Dias - DVRO Granted and Jurisdiction Found - Response Requested

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Counsel — please respond as soon as possible regarding your availability to meet confer live or we will need to seek relief from the Court tomorrow given the circumstances.

Thad A. Davis

Partner

T: <u>+1 415.393.8251</u> M: +1 415 730 5434 <u>TDavis@gibsondunn.com</u>

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP One Embarcadero Center Suite 2600, San Francisco, CA 94111-3715

On 10/03/2025, at 12:48, Flores, Rommy < RFlores@gibsondunn.com > wrote:

Richard -

Please advise if you are available today to meet and confer on the below, or alternatively, if you have been authorized to accept service on your client's behalf of the DVRO as required by the Court's November 13 Order. We have not received a response from you.

Thanks, Rommy

Rommy Flores

Of Counsel

<u>T: +1 213.229.7966 | M: +1 213.335.1672</u> <u>RFlores@gibsondunn.com</u>

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP 333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197

From: Flores, Rommy < RFlores@gibsondunn.com>

Sent: Thursday, March 6, 2025 10:53 AM

To: Richard Min < rmin@gkmrlaw.com >; Camilla Redmond < credmond@gkmrlaw.com >; R Azcona

<<u>lr_azcona@yahoo.com</u>>

Cc: Michelle Jacobson-Kwok < <u>Michelle@litlawgroup.com</u>>; Brittani Lash

<brittani@ljtlawgroup.com>; Davis, Thad A. <TDavis@gibsondunn.com>; Hesse, Danielle
<DHesse@gibsondunn.com>

Subject: Dias v. Dias - DVRO Granted and Jurisdiction Found - Response Requested

Richard, et al. -

Although your client, in seeking to have his petition dismissed with prejudice, agreed to jurisdiction by California courts over all custody and related proceedings, he nevertheless argued in front of the state court that he was not subject to jurisdiction by California state courts in direct violation of the conditions attached to Judge Chen's order dismissing his petition with prejudice. That bad faith argument has failed. On March 4, 2025, Judge Thomas Weathers of the Alameda County Superior Court granted Ms. Cavaco Dias' temporary restraining order against your client, Casimiro Jose Canha Cavaco Dias and denied his motion to dismiss based on lack of jurisdiction, ruling that California clearly has jurisdiction over your client. Please see all relevant documents attached.

Judge Chen's November 13 Order granting your request for dismissal with prejudice imposed certain conditions upon your client, including that "Petitioner shall accept service and cooperate as to the service of custody, visitation, and domestic violence pleadings." Attached please find the temporary restraining order and Judge Weathers' Order regarding jurisdiction. Per Judge Chen's order, your client is required to accept service of the Order through you.

Please let us know if you and your client nonetheless will defy the order and contest service through you on your client's behalf by tomorrow at 5 PM ET given the gravity of the subject matter.

We note that neither Mr. Min nor Ms. Azcona have filed notices of withdrawal as counsel for Mr. Dias.

We look forward to hearing from you. Ms. Dias reserves all rights regarding Mr. Dias' continued litigation misconduct and anyone facilitating it.

Best,

Rommy

Rommy Flores

Of Counsel

<u>T: +1 213.229.7966</u> | <u>M: +1 213.335.1672</u>

RFlores@gibsondunn.com

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP 333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197

This message may contain confidential and privileged information for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, disclosure, distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If it has been sent to you in error, please reply to advise the sender of the error and then immediately delete this message.

Please see our website at https://www.gibsondunn.com/ for information regarding the firm and/or our privacy policy.